

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

11 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
12 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 07-CV-5944-JST

MDL No. 1917

13 This Document Relates to:

14 *ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS*  
15  
16  
17

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING THE  
IRICO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO  
DISMISS**

Date: May 30, 2019

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Judge: Honorable Jon S. Tigar

Courtroom: 9

1 On July 18, 2018, Defendants Irico Display Devices Co., Ltd. (“Irico Display”) and Irico  
2 Group Corporation (“Irico Group”) (together the “Irico Defendants”) filed Motions to Dismiss for  
3 Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)) (ECF Nos. 5312, 5313), and on  
4 March 19, 2019, the Irico Defendants filed Amended Motions to Dismiss Claims of Direct  
5 Purchaser Plaintiffs for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)) (ECF Nos.  
6 5410, 5412). On April 1, 2019, Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs filed their Opposition to the Amended  
7 Motions to Dismiss. On May 2, 2019, the Irico Defendants filed a joint Reply. On May 30, 2019,  
8 the Court held a hearing on the motions. The Court, having reviewed the motion, the pleadings and  
9 other papers on file in this Action, and the statements of counsel and the parties, hereby finds that  
10 the motions should be DENIED.

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

12 1. The Court finds that, as of November 26, 2007, Irico Display was not an “organ of a  
13 foreign state” within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1603(b)(2).

14 2. The Court finds that the actions of the Irico Defendants “cause[d] a direct effect in  
15 the United States” under 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(2).

16 3. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the Irico Defendants.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18  
19 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
20 Hon. Jon S. Tigar  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28